

REMARKS

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1 through 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Jett et al. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lau et al. Indication is given that claims 12 through 17 are objected to for dependence upon a rejected base claim but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of base and intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation in Applicants inventive structure referred to as angled dispersal apertures. Claim 9 has been canceled. Claim 10 has been amended to correct typographical errors and to more clearly set forth Applicants plurality of angled dispersal apertures for introducing swirling turbulence into the material flow. Claim 11 has been amended to comply with Examiners indication that claim 15 would be allowable if amended to include all limitations of its parent claim (claim 11). Thus, the amendment of claim 11 presented herein is in compliance with Examiners objection to claim 15 by combining the subject matter of claim 11 and 15 into amended claim 11. In favor of this amendment, claim 15 is cancelled. Claim 16 is amended to shift its dependence to canceled claim 15 to amended claim 11. The remaining claims set forth in Applicants claim list as "original" remain unchanged.

With respect to Examiner rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC 112, it is believed

that Applicants amendment of claim 1 to specifically set forth the element of a "texture supply" renders claims 6 and 7 correct under 35 USC 112.

With respect to Examiners rejection of claims 1 through 10 under 35 USC 102(b) based upon Jett et al., Applicant asserts that Applicants amendment of claims 1 and 10 to more clearly recite the element of Applicants novel angled dispersal apertures introducing turbulence and swirl into the flowing texture material is neither shown nor contemplated within Jett.

With respect to Examiners rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 102(b), it is believed that Applicants amendment of claim 11 to include the subject matter of objected claim 15 now places claim 11 in condition for allowance.

In review of the foregoing remarks and claim amendments set forth in Applicants Claim List, it is believed that Applicants claims as amended set forth patentable subject matter and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Roy A. Ekstrand
Registration No. 27,485
Attorney for the Applicant